

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application. Claims 1, 41-81 are pending in the application.

The Examiner has provisionally rejected claims 1, 41-81 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-41 of U.S. Patent No. 6,658,151 in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,835,922 (hereinafter "Shima"). In response, Applicants are filing simultaneously herewith, a terminal disclaimer in which a terminal portion of the claims of the subject application that extends beyond the term of the claims of the U.S. Patent No. 6,658,151, if the subject application were to mature into a granted patent is disclaimed. It is respectfully submitted that in view of the terminal disclaimer, the Examiner should withdraw his rejection of claims 1, 41-81 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 41-81 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

The applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection and submit that the specification and figures, as originally submitted, are sufficient to reasonably convey to one skilled in the art that the applicants possessed the invention as claimed in claims 1 and 41-81.

Claim 1 states "examining whether the at least one matched document satisfies a predetermined security criteria based on an attribute associated with the at least one matched document, to determine whether an operation on the input document is allowed." Support for this claim can be found in the specification on page 17, line 8 through page 18, line 26. Specifically, the specification describes documents which are subject to confidentiality requirements, protected by copyright, as well as other security requirements. Further, the specification provides "the document copying system 80 may

also be used to prevent unauthorized copyright violation or even to automatically charge a license fee from the person seeking to copy the document” (Specification, page 17, lines 18-20). Thus, the specification describes a security criterion for use in a document processing system (Specification, page 15, line 25 to page 17, line 17).

Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is sufficiently described and supported by the specification, so as to satisfy the written description requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 54 and 68 contain similar limitations and features as those discussed above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, claims 54 and 68 are analogously supported by the specification and figures and satisfy the written description requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.


Furthermore, for at least the same reasons that claims 1, 54, and 68 satisfy the written description requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, dependent claims 41-53, 55-67, and 69-81, which depend on claims 1, 54, and 68 respectively satisfy the written description requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 have been overcome by the remarks. Applicants submit that claims 1, 41-81 are now in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any fee deficiency that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 7/27/12



Michael J. Mallie
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 36,591

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300